



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,915	08/31/2001	Andreas Westendorf	10191/2007	3903

7590
KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004

01/29/2007

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,915

Applicant(s)

WESTENDORF ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Pyzocha

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 22-46 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/01/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 22-24, 26-28, 31-34, 36, and 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by England et al. (US 6948073).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 22, 23, and 41-45, England et al. discloses transmitting first data to a first processor from one of a data medium drive and a third processor (see column 2 lines 45-64); transmitting second data to a second processor, the second data being based on the first data; checking the second data in the second processor to determine if the first data may be processed in the first processor (see column 3 lines 14-44); transmitting a positive check result to the first processor (see column 3 lines 34-44); and responsive to receiving the positive check result, processing the first data at the first processor (see column 3 lines 45-55).

As per claim 24, England et al. discloses the limitations substantially similar to those of claim 22 and further discloses, wherein the step of transmitting the first data include transmitting the first data to the first processor from a data medium drive, and wherein the method further comprises: checking in the second processor an identity of a data carrier in the data medium drive (see column 3 lines 34-44).

As per claim 26, England et al. discloses checking an error-free transmission in at least one of the first processor and the second processor (see column 3 lines 2-9).

As per claims 27 and 28, England et al. discloses the data is transmitted in encoded form (see column 3 lines 2-44).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 31, 33-34 and 36, England et al. discloses accessing a database and allowing and storing data (see column 3 lines 34-44).

As per claim 32, England et al. discloses, initiating by the second processor a payment process as a function of the second data (see column 20 lines 54-63).

As per claims 39 and 40, England et al. discloses determining a first check code is determined from the first data; and forming the second data at least in part from the first check code (see column 3 lines 2-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England et al. as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Okada (US 6704872).

As per claim 25, England et al. discloses transmitting the first data to the first processor from a third processor (see column 2 lines 45-60 and figure 1), but fails to disclose including an identity of the processor with the authentication information.

However, Okada teaches including such information (see Abstract).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to including the identity of the processor with the information of England et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to restrict the use of a specific software program to a single processor (see Okada abstract).

7. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England et al.

As per claims 29 and 30, England et al. fails to disclose the use of wireless connections.

However, Official Notice is taken that at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use wireless connections.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for mobility.

Art Unit: 2137

8. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England et al. as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Gurr (US 4264960).

As per claim 35, England et al. fails to disclose starting a check of the first data in the first processor; and restarting the check in the first processor if the check has not been run through completely.

However, Gurr et al teaches such a check (see column 16 line 52 through column 17 line 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the checking system of Gurr in the England et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to check a message for errors (see Gurr column 16 line 52 through column 17 line 3).

9. Claims 37 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England et al. as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Coley et al. (US 5790664).

As per claim 37, England et al. fails to disclose deleting data if there is no license.

However, Coley et al. teaches such a practice (see column 14 lines 57-67).

Art Unit: 2137

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to delete the content of England et al. if there is no license.

Motivation to do so would have been to protect the data from unauthorized use (see Coley et al. column 14 lines 57-67).

As per claim 46, the modified England et al. and Coley et al. system discloses the checking is executed at specifiable time intervals (see column 8 lines 54-69 and column 9 lines 1-22 and 42-51).

10. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England et al. as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Flick (US 6140939).

As per claim 38, England et al. fails to disclose delivering a warning if the first data is not released.

However, Flick teaches such a warning (see column 3 lines 7-23).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the warning of Flick in the system of England et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for updating of samples (see column 3 lines 7-23).

Art Unit: 2137

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP


EMMANUELLE L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER